

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Action Memorandum No. A-256

Date 11 June 1963

A  
C  
T  
I  
O  
N

M  
E  
M  
O  
R  
A  
N  
D  
U  
M

TO : General Counsel

SUBJECT : Request by the Attorney General to Review CIA Information  
Concerning the Attorney General Prior to Its Dissemination  
REFERENCE: Memorandum for DDCI from Chief, SAS, Subject as above,  
dated 3 June 1963 with attachments

1. Reference is made to the attached request by the Attorney General to review CIA information concerning the Attorney General prior to its dissemination, and to the study by the Chief, Special Affairs Staff, as forwarded through the Deputy Director (Plans).

2. It seems to me that in spite of the obvious, sensitive, political nature of the request, the intelligence community cannot adequately perform its functions under the restraints proposed by Mr. Nolan of the Attorney General's office. If we were to comply with the Attorney General's request, similar treatment should likewise be afforded the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and every other Cabinet member as well as many other senior officials of the government. I can see no justification from an intelligence viewpoint for complying with this request either because of the assigned functions of the Attorney General or because of the relationship of the Attorney General to the President. However, I am as sensitive to the delicacies of this matter as is anyone else and, before indicating any action outside of the Agency, I would like you to prepare a brief of a possible approach to Mr. Nolan or the Attorney General by you. In order to fortify yourself as well as myself, I would like you, in collaboration with DD/P, to work up a reasonable number of similar reports which would involve the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and other senior officials of this government along similar lines as those put forward in the attached study and those to which the Attorney General apparently offered objection.

SUSPENSE DATE:

- 2 -

3. If the foregoing is profitable, it would then appear to be logical for you to talk to Mr. Nolan in order to dissuade the Attorney General from his basic request and possibly even to dissuade him from establishing the type of direct, personal contact which leads to such reports in the first place.

Marshall S. Carter  
Lieutenant General, USA  
Deputy Director

MSC:blp

Distribution:

Original - General Counsel w/reference

1 - DD/P w/o reference

1 - DDCI w/o reference

1 - Executive Director w/o reference

✓ 1 - ER w/o reference

100-111111-1111

7004 15 11 28 AM '83

*big file in DDJ*  
*to Gen. Counsel*

OGC 63-1696a

*ER*

17 June 1963

*"OK MSC - send to DDP for guidance MSC"*

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT: Request by Attorney General to Review CIA  
Information Concerning the Attorney General  
Prior to its Dissemination

REFERENCE: Action Memorandum No. A-256, dtd 11 Jun 63

1. This memorandum is for information.
2. We talked to Mr. John Nolan, Department of Justice, today about his earlier request on behalf of the Attorney General for reports mentioning the Attorney General's name. It appeared that the real problem was to make arrangements so that if the Attorney General were mentioned in reports he would be informed so that he would not be unaware if someone else brought the matter up to him.
3. Mr. Nolan agreed that the problem was probably caused by the delay in our dissemination through the FBI and that this delay was on the Bureau's end. We explained to him that if a high official were mentioned the first question was whether the information had intelligence value. If not, it was discarded; if so, it was then looked at to see if the information might be critical of the individual. If so, a memorandum would be prepared which would go to the individual concerned and on a very limited distribution to others who needed the intelligence information. If it were not deemed critical, the electronic dissemination would be made. It was this dissemination which had been delayed in the Bureau so that the Attorney General did not get timely notice.
4. I told Mr. Nolan we would handle the matter any way the Attorney General wished, including giving him a link to the electronic dissemination system if the FBI link were not convenient to the

*Action Memo*  
*A-256*

Attorney General's office. Mr. Nolan said he would far prefer it if we could arrange to deliver the reports in question so that they would not have to screen all the take at their end. I said this was feasible and checked with [ ] Chief, Intelligence Reports Control, FI, who said that when any such report came in critical mention of the Attorney General would be handled in accordance with established practice and noncritical mention could be hand carried to the Attorney General, probably being delivered in about an hour's time. I checked with Mr. Nolan to see if he wanted night messages or out-of-hours service, and he replied in the negative, so the reports can be delivered to his office during office hours. According to [ ] this presents no problem.

s/ Lawrence R. Houston

LAWRENCE R. HOUSTON  
General Counsel

cc: C/SAS  
C/FI/Intell Reports Control

SEP 11 1980  
15 NOV 1980

SEP 11 1980  
15 NOV 1980

SEP 11 1980  
15 NOV 1980